

REMARKS

In response to the final Office Action of November 20, 2009, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-7, 10-11, 18-25, and 28-30. A slight amendment has been made to the specification at page 2, line 3 to correct a grammatical (spelling) error.

More particularly, at section 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-7, 10-15, 18-25, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over US patent 6,259,045, Imai, in view of US patent 7,345,592, Rogers.

With regard to claim 1, the Office asserts that Imai teaches a cover for an electronic device comprising a decoration which is visible to a user when said cover is connected to an electronic device; contact sensitive components arranged such that it generates an electrical signal when a part of said decoration associated to said contact sensitive component is touched; and a connection component to electrically connect said contact sensitive component to a processing component. The Office asserts that Imai does not expressly teach that the decoration is adjustable by a processing component,¹ but that Rogers teaches an electronic cover, including a decoration (LED) which is adjustable by a processing component and that it would therefore be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Rogers' electronic cover having an LED controlled by a CPU into Imai's electronic cover so as to illuminate activated push buttons. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As set forth in its Abstract and at column 2, line 33 through column 3, line 20, and as shown in Figure 2, Imai is directed to a keybutton-equipped device which has a board 40 with electrodes 41 at predetermined positions on which a predetermined number of sensitive elements at predetermined positions are provided; a case 20 in which the board is mounted and a predetermined number of holes 21 formed at positions corresponding to the sensitive elements on the board, as well as a keypad 10

¹ Claim 1 does not require that the decoration is adjustable by a processing component. It is assumed that the Office is referring to the feature in claim 1 that recites "said processor configured to be provided with said electrical signal generated by said contact sensitive component to at least realize a specific function."

(Figures 1A and 1B) which is of a stretchy material (such as rubber and plastic) and is formed with a tubular body to cover and tighten the case. The overall arrangement of the device is shown in Figure 3 of Imai.

It is therefore clear that Imai only discloses the use of a board 40 having electrodes 41 (Imai, Figures 2-7 and column 2, lines 43-46). Imai does not disclose a processor wherein a cover is configured to provide the processor in the cover, as well as the processor being configured to be provided with electrical signals generated by the contact sensitive component to at least realize a specific function. At best, the board 40 of Imai corresponds to the connection component of the cover as set forth in claim 1. In this regard, the Office at page 3, line 4 of the Office Action states "Imai teaches a cover for an electronic device including light emitting [diode]". However, the light emitting diodes discussed in Imai, such as at column 4, lines 51-54 are with regard to an LED which is adjacent to the electrode of the board and therefore is not in the cover.

It is clear that Imai only discloses the use of a board 40 (see Figure 2) having electrodes 41 (see Figures 2-7 and column 2, lines 43-46 of Imai). Imai does not disclose a processor in the cover, as well as said processor configured to be provided with electrical signals generated by contact sensitive components to at least realize a specific function.

As a result, it is respectfully submitted that the feature of the present invention setting forth that the cover is configured to provide the processor in the cover, as well as the processor configured to be provided with electrical signals generated by the contact sensitive component so as to at least realize a specific function are not disclosed or suggested by Imai. At best, the teaching of Imai would show to a person of ordinary skill in the art that electrodes 41 and board 40 might be connected to a processor associated with an electronic device, but completely fails to suggest that the cover is configured so as to provide the processor in the cover and wherein the processor is

configured to receive the electrical signals generated by the contact sensitive component to at least realize a specific function.

Furthermore, Rogers is cited by the Office as teaching an electronic cover, including a decoration (LED) which is adjustable by a processing component. Rogers is directed to a hand-held remote control unit which has an LED that can be enabled depending upon the use of the remote control device (such as if it is to be used for operating a video gaming system) (Rogers, Abstract). In particular, Rogers shows a remote control unit which represents the entire electronic device and not just a cover. There is no indication that the operating circuitry shown in Rogers could form a part of a cover. In Rogers, only housing 11 would be understood to form the cover and at most base panel 12, keypad 13, and faceplate 14 could be seen as additional elements of the cover. None of the other elements is shown or mentioned in Rogers to belong to an entity that could be considered a cover. Furthermore, the passage at column 6, lines 29-55 as relied upon by the Office does not provide any suggestion that microprocessor 41 of Figure 4 or Figure 6 could be a part of a cover.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Rogers does not disclose the missing features in Imai that the Office relies upon with regard to claim 1.

In fact, if for purposes of argument, one is to combine Imai with Rogers, one would end up with a device where the microprocessor or CPU controlling the LED would be inside the device and not in the cover for the device.

It is respectfully submitted that there is a clear difference between a processor located in a cover for an electronic device compared to some combination of Imai with Rogers where the processor is inside the device. When utilizing the processor in the cover, it is possible to provide exchangeable covers which, of course, would not be possible in the combination of Imai and Rogers. The present invention as claimed in claim 1 is to a cover for an electronic device, it is not the electronic device itself.

In view of the all of the foregoing reasons, it is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 1 is distinguished over Imai in view of Rogers.

Independent electronic device claim 12 and independent cover claim 30 comprise the same distinguishing features as claim 1 and for similar reasons are also believed to be distinguished over Imai in view of Rogers.

Furthermore, dependent claims 2-6, 10, 11, 13-15, 18-25, 28, and 29 are also to be distinguished over Imai in view of Rogers at least in view of their ultimate dependency from an independent claim which is allowable.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the rejection of the claims in view of Imai and Rogers is respectfully submitted and early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The undersigned respectfully submits that no fee is due for filing this Amendment After Final. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to deposit account 23-0442 any fee deficiency required to submit this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 20, 2010

/Alfred A. Fressola/
Alfred A. Fressola
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 27,550

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER
SLUYS & ADOLPHSON LLP
Building Five, Bradford Green
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955